

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 17 are currently pending, all of which are rejected.

Claims rejections 35 USC 102

Claims 1-9 and 11 are rejected as being anticipated by Shambroon, US 5,923,756.

Reference is initially made to Fig. 1 of Shambroon. The aim of client 200 is to obtain data from destination server 500. In order to obtain this data the client 200 issues a request *to the destination server*. The request is verified in various ways involving key distribution center 400. If the client is suitably verified then the client is able to download data from the destination server 500, or carry out any other desired operation. However it is noted that the operation of downloading or uploading data or the like is carried out *at the same destination server that is originally addressed*.

The Examiner is now referred to claim 1 of the present application. In claim 1 it is clearly stated in step a) that the data is requested from a first server, “requesting, from a requesting computer, access to *data from a first server*,”. The requesting, made from the requesting computer is for access to data from a first server.

However, as stated later in the claim, the data is not on the first server. The data is actually on a second server, the second server *not* being the server to whom the request was initially issued. In fact all that the first server has done is carried out a verification check. Clients who get a valid ticket and a referral actually download the data from the second server, a server that they knew nothing of when making their original request.

The same feature of two servers, one for fielding the initial request, and the other actually holding the data, is claimed in the second independent claim, claim 12 as well. In claim 12 the first server only refers the requestor to the second server if the verification is successful. Otherwise the instructions are lost or corrupted or the like.

The use of two servers in this way, one as the destination for the initial request and the other for storing the data, is neither taught nor suggested in Shambroom. On the contrary, Shambroom is insistent throughout his application that the data is on the destination server, meaning the server to which the initial request is addressed. Shambroom is thus unable to achieve the level of security that is available according to the present embodiments.

All of the matters raised by the Examiner are believed to be overcome. In view of the foregoing, it is believed this application is now in condition for allowance, and an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sol Sheinbein', written in a cursive style.

Sol Sheinbein
Registration No. 25,457

Date: November 4, 2004